

v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053, (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as contained in the . . . claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

Claim 1 recites, “a mirrored entrance aperture.” The Examiner stated, “Kaplan shows in fig. 1 an integrating rod . . . with an entrance face which has a circular transmissive aperture (34) centered within a mirrored portion (24)” The applicant respectfully submits Kaplan does not show, teach, or suggest “a mirrored entrance aperture” as recited by Claim 1. The Kaplan states, “The cavity 12 is formed by a generally cylindrical wall surface 24 and two generally planar wall surfaces 26 and 28 in wall portions 27 and 29, respectively.” Kaplan col. 3, lines 49-52. Kaplan further states, “the light-contacting surfaces within the cavity 12 are painted with Spectrafect™ paint which is a highly reflective diffuse, white paint” Kaplan col. 4, line 68 through col. 5, line 2. Kaplan further states, “All internal surfaces of cavity 12, including surfaces of baffle 36, are highly reflective diffuse surfaces.”

The fifth edition of the McGraw-Hill Dictionary of Scientific and Technical Terms defines mirror as, “A surface which specularly reflects a large fraction of incident light.” Webster’s II New Riverside Dictionary defines mirror as, “1. A surface, as of glass, that reflects undiffused light to form an image of an object.” Kaplan’s diffuse surface 24 cannot be considered “a mirrored entrance aperture” as recited by Claim 1. The Examiner’s rejection, therefore, is unsupported by the prior art, fails to establish a *prima facie* case of anticipation, and should be withdrawn.

Not only does Kaplan fail to show or teach the recited elements of Claim 1, Kaplan further cannot be considered to suggest the recited elements of Claim 1 since Kaplan teaches away from the “mirror entrance aperture” recited by Claim 1 as evidenced by the passages of Kaplan cited above.

For the reasons argued above, the Examiner has failed to present a *prima facie* case of anticipate of Claim 1 by Kaplan and the defective rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 5, 6, and 15-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

Kaplan. Claims 3, 4, 7, and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaplan. The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claims 2-7, 10-13, and 15-20 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with respect to the base claim, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the recited elements of the base claim, much less the recited elements of the base claim in combination with the further recited elements of the dependent claims.

Attached hereto is a marked-up version of the changes made to the specification and claims by the current amendment. The attached page is captioned "Version With Markings To Show Changes Made."

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application, Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 15-20 accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that Claims 1-7, 10-13, and 15-20 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418

Version With Markings To Show Changes Made

In the specification:

The title on line 1 of page 1 has been amended as follows:

ROD INTEGRATORS ~~FOR LIGHT RECYCLING~~